

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/823,443 | WIEN ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Peter A. Hruskoci | 1724 | |

All Participants:

Status of Application: _____

(1) Peter A. Hruskoci. (3) _____

(2) Eugene I. Shkurko. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 10 August 2007

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Prior Art Rejections as stated in the prior Office action dated 12/28/06

Claims discussed:

All

Prior art documents discussed:

Prior Art of Record


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

Amendments to claim 1 were suggested to patentably distinguish over the prior art of record. No agreement was reached.

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)